Cities and Counties Not Currently Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

This determination represents Annual Progress Report (APR) data received as of January 31, 2018, and will be updated at least quarterly to incorporate new or corrected data provided by jurisdictions. The following 13 jurisdictions have met their prorated Lower (Very-Low and Low) and Above-Moderate Income Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the Reporting Period and submitted their latest APR (2016). These jurisdictions are not currently subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining, but the jurisdictions are still encouraged to promote streamlining. All other cities and counties beyond these 13 are subject to at least some form of SB 35 streamlining, as indicated on the following page.

For more detail on the proration methodology or background data see the SB 35 Determination Methodology.

	JURISDICTION
1	BEVERLY HILLS
2	CARPINTERIA
3	CORTE MADERA
4	FOSTER CITY
5	HILLSBOROUGH
6	LEMON GROVE
7	NAPA COUNTY
8	SAN ANSELMO
9	SAN FERNANDO
10	57 11 1 2 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1
11	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
12	SONOMA COUNTY
13	WEST HOLLYWOOD
	<u> </u>

January 31, 2018 Page 1 of 7

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 10% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the most recent Annual Progress Report (2016), these jurisdictions are subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 378 jurisdictions:

	JURISDICTION
1	ADELANTO
2	ALAMEDA COUNTY
3	ALISO VIEJO
	ALPINE COUNTY
	ALTURAS
	AMADOR
	AMADOR COUNTY
	ANDERSON
	ANGELS CAMP
	APPLE VALLEY
	ARCADIA
	ARCATA
	ARROYO GRANDE
	ARTESIA
	ARVIN
	ATWATER
	AUBURN
	AVALON
	AVENAL
	AZUSA
	BAKERSFIELD
	BALDWIN PARK
	BANNING
	BARSTOW
	BEAUMONT
	BELL GARDENS
	BELMONT
	BELVEDERE
	BENICIA
30	BIG BEAR LAKE

	JURISDICTION
31	BIGGS
32	BISHOP
33	BLUE LAKE
	BLYTHE
35	BRADBURY
	BRAWLEY
	BREA
	BUENA PARK
	BURBANK
	BUTTE COUNTY
	CALABASAS
	CALAVERAS COUNTY
	CALEXICO
	CALIFORNIA CITY
	CALIMESA
	CALIPATRIA
	CAMARILLO
	CANYON LAKE
	CAPITOLA
	CARLSBAD
	CARMEL
	CARSON
	CATHEDRAL
	CERES
	CERRITOS
	CHINO
	CHOWCHILLA
	CITRUS HEIGHTS
	CLAREMONT
60	CLAYTON

	JURISDICTION
61	CLEARLAKE
	CLOVERDALE
	CLOVIS
	COACHELLA
	COALINGA
	COLFAX
67	COLMA
	COLTON
69	COLUSA
70	COLUSA COUNTY
71	COMMERCE
	COMPTON
	CONCORD
	CORCORAN
	CORNING
	COTATI
	COVINA
	CRESCENT CITY
	CUDAHY
	CULVER CITY
	CYPRESS
	DEL NORTE COUNTY
83	
84 85	DELANO DESERT HOT SPRINGS
	DIAMOND BAR
	DINUBA DIXON
	DORRIS
	DOS PALOS
90	DOS PALOS

January 31, 2018 Page 2 of 7

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 10% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the most recent Annual Progress Report (2016), these jurisdictions are subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 378 jurisdictions:

JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION
91 DOWNEY	131 HERMOSA BEACH	171 LAKE ELSINORE
92 DUARTE	132 HESPERIA	172 LAKEPORT
93 DUNSMUIR	133 HIDDEN HILLS	173 LANCASTER
94 EAST PALO ALTO	134 HIGHLAND	174 LASSEN COUNTY
95 EASTVALE	135 HOLLISTER	175 LATHROP
96 EL CAJON	136 HOLTVILLE	176 LAWNDALE
97 EL CENTRO	137 HUGHSON	177 LEMOORE
98 EL MONTE	138 HUMBOLDT COUNTY	178 LINCOLN
99 EL SEGUNDO	139 HUNTINGTON BEACH	179 LINDSAY
100 EMERYVILLE	140 HUNTINGTON PARK	180 LIVE OAK
101 ENCINITAS	141 HURON	181 LIVINGSTON
102 ESCALON	142 IMPERIAL	182 LODI
103 ESCONDIDO	143 IMPERIAL BEACH	183 LOMA LINDA
104 ETNA	144 IMPERIAL COUNTY	184 LOMITA
105 EUREKA	145 INDUSTRY	185 LOMPOC
106 EXETER	146 INGLEWOOD	186 LONG BEACH
107 FAIRFAX	147 INYO COUNTY	187 LOOMIS
108 FARMERSVILLE	148 IONE	188 LOS ALAMITOS
109 FERNDALE	149 IRWINDALE	189 LOS ALTOS HILLS
110 FILLMORE	150 ISLETON	190 LOS ANGELES COUNTY
111 FIREBAUGH	151 JACKSON	191 LOS BANOS
112 FORT BRAGG	152 JURUPA VALLEY	192 LOYALTON
113 FORT JONES	153 KERMAN	193 LYNWOOD
114 FORTUNA	154 KERN COUNTY	194 MADERA
115 FOUNTAIN VALLEY	155 KING CITY	195 MALIBU
116 FOWLER	156 KINGS COUNTY	196 MANHATTAN BEACH
117 FRESNO	157 KINGSBURG	197 MANTECA
118 GARDENA	158 LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE	198 MARICOPA
119 GLENN COUNTY	159 LA HABRA	199 MARINA
120 GONZALES	160 LA HABRA HEIGHTS	200 MARTINEZ
121 GRAND TERRACE	161 LA MESA	201 MARYSVILLE
122 GRASS VALLEY	162 LA MIRADA	202 MAYWOOD
123 GREENFIELD	163 LA PALMA	203 MCFARLAND
124 GRIDLEY	164 LA PUENTE	204 MENDOCINO COUNTY
125 GUADALUPE	165 LA QUINTA	205 MENDOTA
126 GUSTINE	166 LA VERNE	206 MENIFEE
127 HALF MOON BAY	167 LAGUNA BEACH	207 MENLO PARK
128 HANFORD	168 LAGUNA NIGUEL	208 MERCED
129 HAWAIIAN GARDENS	169 LAGUNA WOODS	209 MERCED COUNTY
130 HAYWARD	170 LAKE COUNTY	210 MILL VALLEY

January 31, 2018 Page 3 of 7

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 10% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the most recent Annual Progress Report (2016), these jurisdictions are subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 378 jurisdictions:

JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION
211 MILLBRAE	251 PISMO BEACH	291 SAN DIMAS
212 MODESTO	252 PLEASANT HILL	292 SAN GABRIEL
213 MODOC COUNTY	253 PLYMOUTH	293 SAN JACINTO
214 MONTAGUE	254 POINT ARENA	294 SAN JOAQUIN
215 MONTCLAIR	255 POMONA	295 SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
216 MONTEBELLO	256 PORT HUENEME	296 SAN JUAN BAUTISTA
217 MONTEREY	257 PORTERVILLE	297 SAN LEANDRO
218 MONTEREY PARK	258 PORTOLA	298 SAN MATEO COUNTY
219 MORAGA	259 POWAY	299 SAND CITY
220 MORENO VALLEY	260 RANCHO CORDOVA	300 SANGER
221 MORRO BAY	261 RANCHO MIRAGE	301 SANTA BARBARA
222 MOUNT SHASTA	262 RED BLUFF	302 SANTA CLARITA
223 MURRIETA	263 REDDING	303 SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
224 NATIONAL CITY	264 REDLANDS	304 SANTA MONICA
225 NEEDLES	265 REDONDO BEACH	305 SANTA PAULA
226 NEVADA CITY	266 REDWOOD CITY	306 SANTA ROSA
227 NEWARK	267 REEDLEY	307 SANTEE
228 NEWMAN	268 RIALTO	308 SARATOGA
229 NORCO	269 RICHMOND	309 SAUSALITO
230 NORWALK	270 RIDGECREST	310 SCOTTS VALLEY
231 NOVATO	271 RIO DELL	311 SEAL BEACH
232 OCEANSIDE	272 RIO VISTA	312 SEASIDE
233 OJAI	273 RIPON	313 SEBASTOPOL
234 ONTARIO	274 RIVERBANK	314 SELMA
235 ORANGE	275 RIVERSIDE	315 SHAFTER
236 ORANGE COVE	276 RIVERSIDE COUNTY	316 SHASTA COUNTY
237 ORLAND	277 ROHNERT PARK	317 SHASTA LAKE
238 OROVILLE	278 ROLLING HILLS	318 SIERRA COUNTY
239 OXNARD	279 ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	319 SIERRA MADRE
240 PACIFIC GROVE	280 ROSEMEAD	320 SIGNAL HILL
241 PACIFICA	281 SACRAMENTO	321 SISKIYOU COUNTY
242 PALM DESERT	282 SACRAMENTO COUNTY	322 SOLANA BEACH
243 PALM SPRINGS	283 SALINAS	323 SOLEDAD
244 PALMDALE	284 SAN BENITO COUNTY	324 SOLVANG
245 PALOS VERDES ESTATES	285 SAN BERNARDINO	325 SONOMA
246 PARADISE	286 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	326 SONORA
247 PARAMOUNT	287 SAN BRUNO	327 SOUTH EL MONTE
248 PATTERSON	288 SAN BUENAVENTURA	328 SOUTH GATE
249 PICO RIVERA	289 SAN CLEMENTE	329 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE
250 PINOLE	290 SAN DIEGO COUNTY	330 SOUTH PASADENA
·		

January 31, 2018 Page 4 of 7

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 10% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the most recent Annual Progress Report (2016), these jurisdictions are subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 378 jurisdictions:

	JURISDICTION
331	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO
	STOCKTON
	SUSANVILLE
	SUTTER COUNTY
	TEHACHAPI
336	
337	TEHAMA COUNTY
338	
339	
340	TIBURON
341	TORRANCE
	TRACY
343	
	TRINITY COUNTY
	TRUCKEE
	TULARE
347	
348	
	TUOLUMNE COUNTY
	TURLOCK
351	
	UKIAH
	UNION CITY
	UPLAND
	VALLEJO
356	VENTURA COUNTY
357	VERNON VICTORVILLE
	VILLA PARK
	WATERFORD WATSONVILLE
361	WEED
362	WEST SACRAMENTO
	WESTLAKE VILLAGE
	WESTMORLAND
	WHEATLAND
367	WHITTIER
368	
369	
370	
5.5	====,,,=

	JURISDICTION
	WINTERS
	WOODLAKE
	YOLO COUNTY
	YREKA
	YUBA CITY
376	YUBA COUNTY
	YUCAIPA
378	YUCCA VALLEY

January 31, 2018 Page 5 of 7

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 50% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income), these jurisdictions are subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 10% affordability.

The following list includes the 148 jurisdictions that are not subject to SB 35 streamlining for proposed developments with \geq 10% affordability, but are subject to SB 35 streamlining for proposed developments with \geq 50% affordability.

i	JURISDICTION
	AGOURA HILLS
	ALAMEDA
	ALBANY
	ALHAMBRA
	AMERICAN CANYON
	ANAHEIM
7	ANTIOCH
8	
	ATHERTON
	BELL
	BELLFLOWER
12	BERKELEY
13	BRENTWOOD
14	BRISBANE
	BUELLTON
	BURLINGAME
	CALISTOGA
	CAMPBELL
	CHICO
	CHINO HILLS
	CHULA VISTA
	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
	CORONA
	CORONADO
	COSTA MESA
	CUPERTINO
	DALY CITY
	DANA POINT
	DANVILLE
	DAVIS
	DEL MAR
	DUBLIN
33	EL CERRITO
	EL DORADO COUNTY
35	ELK GROVE

	JURISDICTION
	FAIRFIELD
	FOLSOM
	FONTANA
	FREMONT
40	FRESNO COUNTY
41	FULLERTON
42	GALT
43	GARDEN GROVE
44	GILROY
45	GLENDALE
46	GLENDORA
	GOLETA
48	GROVER BEACH
49	HAWTHORNE
50	HEALDSBURG
	HEMET
	HERCULES
	INDIAN WELLS
	INDIO
	IRVINE
56	LAFAYETTE
	LAGUNA HILLS
	LAKE FOREST
	LAKEWOOD
60	LARKSPUR
61	LIVERMORE
62	LOS ALTOS
	LOS ANGELES
	LOS GATOS
	MADERA COUNTY
	MAMMOTH LAKES
	MARIN COUNTY
	MARIPOSA COUNTY
	MILPITAS
70	MISSION VIEJO

	JURISDICTION
	MONO COUNTY
	MONROVIA
	MONTE SERENO
	MONTEREY COUNTY
	MOORPARK
	MORGAN HILL
	MOUNTAIN VIEW
	NAPA
	NEVADA COUNTY
	NEWPORT BEACH
	OAKDALE
	OAKLAND
	OAKLEY
	ORANGE COUNTY
	ORINDA
	PALO ALTO
	PASADENA
	PASO ROBLES
	PERRIS
91	
	PIEDMONT
	PITTSBURG
	PLACENTIA
	PLACER COUNTY
	PLACERVILLE
	PLEASANTON
	PLUMAS COUNTY
	PORTOLA VALLEY
	RANCHO CUCAMONGA
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES
	RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA
	ROCKLIN
-	ROSEVILLE
105	ROSS

January 31, 2018 Page 6 of 7

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 50% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income), these jurisdictions are subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 10% affordability.

The following list includes the 148 jurisdictions that are not subject to SB 35 streamlining for proposed developments with \geq 10% affordability, but are subject to SB 35 streamlining for proposed developments with \geq 50% affordability.

JURISDICTION
106 SAINT HELENA
107 SAN CARLOS
108 SAN DIEGO
109 SAN FRANCISCO
110 SAN JOSE
111 SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO
112 SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
113 SAN MARCOS
114 SAN MARINO
115 SAN MATEO
116 SAN PABLO
117 SAN RAFAEL
118 SAN RAMON
119 SANTA ANA
120 SANTA CLARA
121 SANTA CLARA COUNTY
122 SANTA CRUZ
123 SANTA FE SPRINGS
124 SANTA MARIA
125 SIMI VALLEY
126 SOLANO COUNTY
127 STANISLAUS COUNTY
128 STANTON
129 SUISUN CITY
130 SUNNYVALE
131 SUTTER CREEK
132 TAFT
133 THOUSAND OAKS
134 TUSTIN
135 VACAVILLE
136 VISALIA
137 VISTA
138 WALNUT
139 WALNUT CREEK
140 WASCO
141 WEST COVINA
142 WESTMINSTER
143 WILDOMAR
144 WINDSOR
145 WOODLAND
146 WOODSIDE

	JURISDICTION
147	YORBA LINDA
148	YOUNTVILLE

January 31, 2018 Page 7 of 7